IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 18956 of 2004

Between:

B.Ramadevi, NMR.,

W/o Late Venkateswara Rao,
Sri V.V.S.S.Devasthanam,

Annavaram,

East Godavari District. **..... PETITIONER**

AND

1. The Commissioner of Endowments,

Government of A.P.,

Hyderabad.
2. Sri V.V.S.S.Devasthanam,

rep., by its Executive Officer.

Annavaram,

East Godavari District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a Writ, Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the impugned action of the respondents in not considering the petitioner for regularisation of her services in spite of her long service of 16 years on N.M.R basis an further not paying minimum fixed scale has been paid to other juniors as highly illegal, arbitrary and violative of Art.14 and 21 of the Constitution of India consequently direct the respondents to regularize the service of the petitioner

in the post of last grade service with consequential benefits.

Counsel for the Petitioner: Mr. G.V.SHIVAJI

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: GP FOR ENDOWMENTS

Counsel for the Respondent No. 2: Mrs. N.INDRANI.

The Court at the stage of admission made the following :

The petitioner is contending that she is working as an NMR in the 2nd respondent-Devasthanam since 1988. She is contending that by virtue of a resolution passed on 3-3-1993 in the meeting of the Executive Officers of various temples, she is entitled to the scale of Attender, but the 2nd respondent is not extending the same to her. The petitioner, therefore, approached this Court seeking a direction to the 2nd respondent to regularize her services and to extend the scale of Attender.

The petitioner directly approached this Court without making any representation to the 2nd respondent. Therefore, it is not desirable to pass any orders touching upon the merits of the case. It would be appropriate for the petitioner to make a representation to the 2nd respondent and it is for the 2nd respondent to pass appropriate orders.

In the light of the above circumstances, the petitioner is directed to make a representation to the 2nd respondent and the 2nd respondent shall after receipt of the said representation, examine whether the petitioner is entitled to the scale of Attender, in pursuance of the resolution of the Executive Officers dated 3-3-1993 and the judgment of this Court dated 28-7-1999 in W.P.No.13450 of 1991 and batch and pass appropriate orders within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of.

_____

(Dr.G.YETHIRAJULU,J)

13th October, 2004.

tsy

To

1. The Commissioner of Endowments,

Government of A.P.,

Hyderabad.

2. The Executive Officer,

Sri V.V.S.S.Devasthanam,

Annavaram,

East Godavari District.

3. Two CCs to the GP for Endowments, High Court of A.P.,

Hyderabad (O.U.T.)

4. Two CD copies.